

Exhibit 4

BOSY & BENNETT

Attorneys and Counselors
300 N. LaSalle St., 49th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60654
(312) 803-0437
www.bosybennett.com

George S. Bosy
gbosy@bosybennett.com
(T) (312) 803-0432

VIA E-MAIL

Indranil Mukerji
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

December 30, 2010

Re: *Parallel Networks, LLC v. Abercrombie & Fitch, et al;*
Civ. Act. No. 6:10-cv-111 (E.D.Tex – Tyler Division)

Dear Mr. Mukerji:

This is in response to Amazon.com, Inc.’s (“Amazon”) notice of Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Parallel Networks, LLC, dated December 21, 2010. For the reasons discussed below, Parallel Networks declines to provide a witness in response to Amazon’s Rule 30(b)(6) notice at this time.

The four topics listed in Schedule A of the notice clearly ask for a witness to testify with respect to Parallel Networks’s infringement contentions. As you know, Parallel Networks has previously provided Amazon with its infringement contentions in a timely fashion pursuant to the discovery schedule in this action. Nothing further is required from Parallel Networks at this time. In addition, Amazon itself has asserted that contention discovery is not appropriate at this time:

Amazon objects to this interrogatory as premature until the Court issues a claim construction in this lawsuit. A requirement that a party provide contentions of this sort early in the litigation is in tension with the established time frames for declaring claim construction positions provided by the Patent Rules.

(Amazon.com, Inc.’s Responses and Objections to Parallel Networks, LLC’s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13) at 8-9) (*see, e.g., Jacobs Chuck Mfg. Co. v. Shandong Weida Mach.*, No. 2:05-cv-00185 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2006); *Software Rights Archive, LLC v. Google Inc.*, No. 2:07-cv-00511 (E.D. Tex. May 26, 2010)). Significantly, Amazon’s assertion that contention discovery is premature at this time was in response to an interrogatory asking Amazon to explain the basis for its belief that it does not infringe any of the claims of the patent in suit; also discovery is ongoing as Amazon freely concedes. Thus, by Amazon’s own admission, Amazon’s notice of deposition seeking Parallel Networks’s infringement contentions is premature and therefore improper at this time. Finally, Parallel Networks expects to provide a very limited number of Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses in this action; as a consequence, efficiency dictates that most or all topics be covered in a limited number of depositions.

Indranil Mukerji
December 30, 2010
Page 2

Please call if you would like to discuss these issues.

Very truly yours,

/s/ George S. Bosy _____

George S. Bosy
BOSY & BENNETT
Attorney for Plaintiff
Parallel Networks, LLC

cc: Stephen A. Marshall, Fish & Richardson P.C.
David R. Bennett, Bosy & Bennett
Craig Tadlock, The Tadlock Law Firm